

12-2-1970

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 12/02/1970

Linda Busch

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

Recommended Citation

Busch, Linda, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 12/02/1970" (1970). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 422.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/422>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact pingfu@cwu.edu.

Lee *Dr. Brooks*

MINUTES: Regular Senate Meeting, 2 December 70
Presiding Officer: Kenneth Harsha, Chairman
Secretary: Linda Busch

RECEIVED
DEC 24 1970
President's Office

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All senators or their alternates were present except Kenneth Berry, Steve Fletcher and Mike Reid.

Others Present: Bryan Gore, Edward Harrington and Donald Schliesman

AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

Mr. Harsha announced that the following item would be included under Communications:

A memo from Bernard Martin, dated December 2.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of November 4 were approved with the following addition and correction:

Under No. 4 of Communications, the Anthropology Department should also have been named as having a departmental personnel committee.

On page 2, paragraph 4, line 12, the word "nation" should be corrected to read "institution."

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

1. A letter from David G. Lygre, dated November 19, requesting the Faculty Senate to consider a proposed modification of the present pass-fail option. This letter will be forwarded to the Senate Curriculum and Student Affairs Committees.
2. A memo from Bernard Martin, dated December 2, giving a source breakdown of the funds to be returned to the State because of two budget reductions requested by the Governor and the failure of the College to meet its budgeted enrollment. A total of \$415,900 must be returned.

REPORTS

A. Executive Committee--Mr. Hammond gave the following report:

1. Balloting for the vacant at-large position from Administration will be completed December 4 and the results will be distributed immediately thereafter.

2. As per Senate direction, an ad hoc committee to study and report on the need for a faculty Code of Conduct has been formed. Without objection, the membership will include:

Bud Klucking	- Biological Sciences
Larry Lawrence	- English
Jim Nylander	- Physical Education
Keith Rinehart	- English
Douglas Sprague	- History

There were no objections to the membership of this committee.

3. A legislative committee has been formed to act as liaison between the faculty and the legislators, review bills which may be presented during the 1971 legislative session and meet with legislators to provide information or express faculty opinion. The committee will maintain contact with legislative committees from other campuses as well as with students and the Executive Committee of the Senate. It will, among other subjects, specifically be concerned with proposed student tuition and fee increases and changes in the TIAA program. Unless the Senate wishes to direct otherwise, the membership of the committee will be:

Ken Berry	- Education
Frank Carlson	- Education
Beverly Heckart	- History
Jerry Jones	- Chemistry
Owen Shadle	- Tech. & Industrial Ed.
Skip Smith	- Biological Sciences
Charles Stastny	- Political Science

There were no objections to the membership of this committee.

Mr. Keller asked if the legislative committee would only be reporting to the Executive Committee, rather than the Faculty Senate. The chairman stated that it would be easier for the legislative committee to report to the Executive Committee, since the Executive Committee meets weekly. Any significant outcomes would be reported to the Faculty Senate.

4. Mr. Hammond reported that 212 faculty members (less than half) returned ballots for the straw vote on collective bargaining. Some form of collective bargaining was favored by 125, no form of collective bargaining legislation was favored by 70, and 17 were undecided.

Of the options -

The Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act of 1967	24 votes for
The Professional Negotiations Law	39 votes for
New Legislation	65 votes for
A strengthening of internal bargaining possibilities	30 votes for

The general sense of the results has been conveyed to Representative Grant.

The Senate may wish to direct further action on the subject. Final tabulations on the straw vote will be made available to the faculty.

5. The time required to achieve a sense of the faculty sentiment on collective bargaining precludes such a ballot on other matters during the legislative session. The Senate can make some preparations prior to the session, but rapid decisions may have to be made and the voice will be very weak if the Legislative Committee and/or Executive Committee members can speak only as individuals.

MOTION NO. 720: Mr. Hammond moved, seconded by Mr. Dillard, to ask for a specific "vote of confidence" to allow the members of these committees, after consultation with other committee members, to speak on behalf of the faculty.

After a brief discussion, the motion carried with a unanimous voice vote.

6. Mr. Hammond added that another related item is funds to send individuals as needed to Olympia. Expenses will be minimized when joint travel can be arranged, but some other funds will be needed. He stated that Eastern manages with voluntary faculty donations of approximately \$5 each. He then asked for some comment on the idea of a legislative fund and/or methods of accumulating same.

The chairman stated that the Executive Committee intends to ask for voluntary contributions from the faculty. He doubted if we should use institutional funds for such a purpose; and, in fact, that the use of state funds might be illegal.

Mr. Keller asked if this problem occurs when President Brooks goes to the legislature to speak on behalf of the college? Dr. Brooks stated that it is part of his responsibility to act on behalf of the college.

Mr. Dillard asked if this could be done through the Central Foundation? The chairman said this was a possibility and worth looking into.

MOTION NO. 721: Mr. Lawrence moved, seconded by Mr. Collins, that the Executive Committee proceed with plans to ask the faculty for contributions. The motion carried by a voice vote.

7. The Executive Committee has followed the pronouncements of the Council on Higher Education with a growing sense of concern and even alarm. We believe this feeling is shared by many others on the faculty. We are in the process of drafting a letter to the Council questioning the desirability of proposed student tuition and fee increases, the justification for fees at the state colleges equal to those of the universities and the assumption that lower division students can be more economically or better educated at the community colleges and ought to be encouraged to attend community colleges through differential fees; inquiring as to the procedure of research and decision-making which the Council employs and the factual basis for their recommendations on costs, enrollment limitations and priorities, and commenting on some of the implications of such actions if they be implemented. Mr. Hammond then asked the Senate for suggestions regarding the proposed letter, to be given

either at the meeting or in writing within the next two days. If the Senate objected to the Executive Committee proceeding on its behalf, he asked that it be made known at that time.

Mr. Hammond then briefly commented on the tuition and fee increases. The Council on Higher Education has recommended that tuition and fees at the state-supported four-year colleges and universities be equalized by 1972-73. The minimum level suggested is \$495.00 for residents and \$1,359.00 for non-residents. The upper limit is \$630.00 for residents and \$1,581.00 for non-residents. Community college fees would be one-half those for state colleges and universities. This does not mean more money for the institutions but simply less from the general fund. Part-time, extension and summer session fees would also be modified.

The Council further recommends that a fraction of the fees be set aside for student financial aids, and programs of tuition and fee waivers would be discontinued.

Mr. Alexander was then asked to comment on the proposed enrollment policies. Mr. Alexander gave a summary of a report from President Brooks to the Board of Trustees regarding the Council on Higher Education's staff revision of enrollment policy recommendations. The report listed recommendations made by the Council and the implementation of those recommendations. Mr. Alexander then went on to express concerns and questions regarding enrollment limitations, graduate programs, student mix, budget formulas, and proposed fee increases.

Mr. Hammond then continued with his report.

8. The Executive Committee requested and received representation on the Committee on Faculty Load. The Vice-Chairman will serve. One meeting has been called and, in briefest summary, the faculty load formulas as currently written are probably inappropriate for an institution such as Central and ought to be changed.
9. A memo from President Brooks regarding Promotions has been discussed. The Executive Committee agrees that teaching performance ought to be one consideration for promotion, but to use it as the only measure would be a grave error. The committee seriously questions that a sampling of popularity at one point in time during a particular class provides a more valid or even equal basis for decision than the judgment rendered after years of association by colleagues and chairmen. We momentarily marveled at the prospect of applying the same criteria to administrators who in the past were granted full professorships in departments and tenure by the Board of Trustees, but cynically concluded that the hurdles, if that is what it means, would be placed only in front of the lower classes, namely teaching faculty.
10. The possibility of establishing a system whereby individual merchants might allow discounts for faculty has been discussed with Mr. Bohne. It was noted that the practice, though not systematic, is not unknown in Ellensburg at this time. Any initiative for further action ought to originate with the faculty.

11. The most recent request by the governor for a return of budgeted funds has resulted in a recommendation by the College Budget Committee to withdraw the \$6,000 which would have supported the annual Spring Symposium. The Deans' Council concurred with this recommendation. This does not mean the Symposium could not be held, as individual departments might wish to contribute. This action, coupled with the recent severe cut in Symposium allocations by the ASC, led Mr. Hammond to make the following motion on behalf of the Executive Committee.

MOTION NO. 722: Mr. Hammond moved, seconded by Mr. Purcell, that planning for the 1971 Spring Symposium be discontinued and, pending more stable financial arrangements, the Symposium be postponed until 1972.

A lengthy discussion followed regarding Symposium. Some of the discussion follows.

Mr. Keller stated that the Philosophy Department was opposed to the withdrawal of funds for the Symposium. He further stated that the Council on Higher Education had argued that one of the things we needed to worry about in respect to student unrest was to find new ways of thinking about education. This is exactly the kind of thing the Symposium is doing.

Mr. McGehee commented that the futility of protest was overwhelming, but the thing that disturbed him was that the President had said that this money does not have to be given back at all. We're doing it to cooperate with the Governor in a dire financial situation. Instead of getting rid of Symposium, he felt we should be in Olympia doing battle to make sure that if people are going to cooperate, it is in fact a real cooperation instead of a one-sided cooperation.

Mr. Alexander asked if any of the student representatives had any idea of how ASC feels on handing part of their support back to the Symposium.

Mrs. Wright stated that Symposium was a sore spot with ASC, because students weren't participating. She commented that she liked the way WSU handles its Symposium, making it a one-day event.

Miss Putnam said that she had served on the Committee for Evaluating the Spring Symposium and she felt that, after a great deal of review by both students and faculty, it was found to be a valuable educational experience on our campus. She would hate to have it omitted or discontinued. She realized that money was the basis for this cut, but she commented, "Why use money that is being spent for educational uplifting; why not use other available sources, if the purpose of this institution is to educate?"

The chairman replied, "Where do we find the other sources?" He stated that the Vice President had attempted not to ask departments for money.

Mr. Lewis stated that we have 24 departments, and if as a faculty we really believe in the Symposium, we only have to take \$250 from each department. This would maybe mean less travel money, etc.

If we really want it as a faculty, we can have it. It isn't going to be that great of a burden on each individual department.

Dr. Harrington stated that when the College Budget Committee attempted to find the money to send back to the Governor, he went on record as saying, "Don't go to the departments; try to find the money elsewhere." The committee came up with \$6,000 from Symposium, along with other monies. Dr. Harrington communicated this to a joint meeting of chairmen and asked if they would talk to their faculty members and see if they had any strong opposition. He added that he had received only one resolution, and at this Senate meeting learned that the Philosophy Department was also opposed. Dr. Harrington went to Deans' Council and they concurred with the Budget Committee that the proposed breakdown was the best one in the interest of the institution. He then communicated this to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, based on the understanding that the Symposium matter would go to the Senate.

Mr. Collins commented that it was his impression that student support for the Symposium was feeble, and that he would vote for its postponement. He said that if there was overwhelming student support, he would be against the motion.

Mr. Brooks stated that one of the problems we face is the problem of budget, and it is not going to get any better--it looks black. He said that the unemployment rate is steadily increasing throughout the state. It looks like budgets are going to be extremely tight the next two years.

Motion No. 722 was then voted on and passed by a voice vote, with Messrs. Doi, Keller, McGehee, Nylander, Reed and Miss Putnam Opposed.

Mr. Lawrence then referred back to Dr. Martin's letter on funds to be sent back to the Governor. He asked where the additional \$150,000 not listed in the breakdown would come from. Dr. Harrington commented on this question and stated that he would ask Dr. Martin for other information, including a breakdown of the money to be returned.

Mr. Harsha commented on the report by Mr. Alexander and on Mr. Hammond's report, and again stated that the Executive Committee intended to write a letter to the Council on Higher Education. He then asked for any suggested input to this letter.

Mr. Gore asked what official bearing this letter would have. Mr. Harsha stated that it would be the voice of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Mr. Alexander said that the Executive Committee had discussed this at its last meeting and the members felt they could not, without Senate resolution, take any really very strong stand except to express some concerns, feelings and opinions. He stated that if the Senate wanted to make a motion to empower the Executive Committee to take a position, it would do so on the Senate's behalf.

Mr. Odell said that he understood that the recommendations of the Council were just recommendations at this point. He asked who the

recommendations would go to. The chairman stated that they would go to the Governor and the Legislature.

Mr. Odell said there would be a meeting of the Joint Boards on December 12, and asked if faculty representatives from each institution would be attending. Mr. Harsha said he would attend that meeting. Mr. Odell further stated that the Executive Committee could proceed with the letter, and after the Board meets, and after talking with its members, could come back to the Senate and propose a lengthy commentary on this.

Mr. Lawrence reminded the Senate that Motion 720, passed at this meeting, empowered the Executive and Legislative Committees to speak for the Faculty Senate concerning legislative matters. Therefore, the Senate need not attempt to draft specific resolutions at this meeting.

Mr. Harsha closed discussion on this matter with the statement that copies of the letter to be sent to the Council on Higher Education would be sent to Senate members, Governor Evans, Walter Howe, members of the Council on Higher Education, the Board of Trustees and others.

B. Standing Committees

1. Budget Committee--No report at this meeting.
2. Curriculum Committee--Mr. Glauert distributed three memos. The first was in regard to the procedure for curriculum changes which are administrative in character. He stated that this memo was distributed at the last Senate meeting (see attachment). The purpose was to cut down on paper work. Mr. Glauert added the following words to the memo, to be inserted in the second paragraph, fifth line, after "other concerned parties,": (department chairmen and members of the curriculum committees.)

MOTION NO. 723: Mr. Glauert moved, seconded by Mr. Hammond, to adopt the procedure for curriculum changes which are administrative in character, as described.

Mr. Lewis said that it occurred to him that all of the items in this memo except No. 5 dealt with minor changes in courses, and No. 5 is a change in a program. He didn't understand the rationale for shifting from changes in courses to changes in a program. How would this be different from a change in a departmental minor?

Mr. Keller asked Mr. Glauert if he would consider the possibility of having a time change on the part of ACCC in case they didn't want to look at something. A period of time would pass before action would be taken in case the ACCC would like to raise a question before these things are approved. If you didn't hear from ACCC, then automatically these would be handled.

Mr. Glauert said that they simply assumed that before the action was taken, all concerned parties would have discussed the matter.

Motion No. 723 was then voted on and carried by a unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Glauert discussed a second memo dealing with the duplication of course titles. This primarily involved courses in Geomorphology and Social Psychology. The problem stemmed from a Geomorphology course presently offered in the Geography Department and a Social Psychology course included as a part of Psychology's curriculum offerings. The Geology Department desired to offer an identically titled course in Geomorphology; the Sociology Department wished to introduce a course in social psychology which would carry the same course title as the one offered in the Psychology Department. Mr. Glauert stated that in this memo, the Senate Curriculum Committee is asking the Senate to vote as departmental members to decide whether they want courses with substantially different content to carry separate titles and courses with identical titles to be cross listed. He said that after a vote on this, he would turn to the ACCC proposals and, according to how the vote went, he would introduce a motion that would affect the course in Social Psychology.

MOTION NO. 724: Mr. Glauert moved for the adoption of the policy concerning duplication of course titles: Courses with substantially different content should carry separate titles. Courses with identical titles should be cross listed. Mr. Clark seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller stated that twice now these proposals have come through Deans' offices and through the ACCC and have been approved both times. Now they are coming back to the Senate. He felt the Senate would be hard put to favor this motion without hearing why this has happened twice.

Mr. Hammond said that the ACCC has been operating on the basis of historical precedent, and it might be leading to great confusion in our catalog. He would think that this is a reasonable kind of a request--if the title is the same, you would expect some confusion to result. If there is different content, it should have a different title.

Mr. McGehee asked to what extent the Curriculum Committee had investigated how such problems have been handled at other schools. Mr. Glauert replied that he had looked at 25 catalogs at schools in various parts of the country and of those 25 schools, there was only one school that listed a course in Social Psychology in the Sociology Department. Mr. McGehee later stated that he agreed that we should not shirk from setting policy, but the evidence submitted by Mr. Glauert was not valid.

Mr. Glauert stated that one of the reasons the committee had brought this to the Senate is that when the two proposals were introduced, it caused a considerable amount of friction between members of the departments involved. One of the intentions of this motion and the suggestion that this policy be adopted is to simply try to prevent this sort of thing from happening as courses with similar titles are introduced.

Motion No. 724 was then passed by a roll call vote of 19 Ayes, 8 Nays and 3 Abstentions:

Ayes: D. Anderson, F. Carlson, G. Clark, F. Collins, P. Douce,
I. Easterling, E. Glauert, K. Hammond, K. Harsha, L. Lawrence,
G. Leavitt, A. Lewis, E. Odell, J. Putnam, G. Reed, O. Shadle,
L. Sparks, H. Williams, C. Wright.

Nays: J. Alexander, D. Dillard, R. Doi, C. Keller, A. Ladd,
C. McGehee, J. Nylander, J. Purcell

Abstentions: L. Duncan, R. Jones, D. Ringe.

Mr. Glauert then introduced his final memo, concerning ACCC proposals.

MOTION NO. 725: Mr. Glauert moved, seconded by Mr. Clark, passage of the ACCC proposals, pages 131 through 139, withholding the Social Psychology course, Soc. No. 307, page 139. After a brief discussion, the motion carried. with Mr. Keller and Mr. McGehee Opposed and Mr. Jones Abstaining.

Mr. Duncan commented that the catalog needs a complete house-cleaning.

3. Code Committee--Mr. Ringe distributed a memo regarding Code interpretations requested by the Faculty Senate chairman. The memo required no motion, just discussion. Mr. Ringe presented the following code interpretations.
 1. Section 2.J.2. states that the chairman of a standing committee must be a senator. The Code Committee feels this is a valid stipulation, and does not recommend change.
 2. While the Code Committee does not agree with the present Code language, Section 2.H. specifically states that, if a senator is to be absent for a quarter or more, a replacement must be elected. This statement will be modified in the upcoming revision of the Code, but we do not propose a change at this time.
 3. Section 2.H. and the interpretation of May 7, 1969, are somewhat nebulous concerning the term of office of the elected replacement for a senator who has resigned. The Code Committee interprets the term of the replacement to be the unexpired term of the senator who resigned. This statement will also be clarified in our revision.

Mr. Ringe further stated that a Legislative Committee and a Salary Committee will be added to the standing committee segment of the revised Code, if the chairman will provide the Code Committee with a statement of their charges.

Mr. Ringe then asked Senate members for ideas and suggestions regarding changes that should be made in the Faculty Code.

4. Personnel Committee--No report at this meeting.
 5. Student Affairs Committee--Mr. McGehee stated that the Pass-Fail program would be discussed at the January Senate meeting.
- C. Report from the Chair--There was no report from the Chair.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business to be discussed.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business to be discussed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

M E M O R A N D U M

Attachment

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Senate Curriculum Committee

DATE: November 2, 1970

RE: Procedure for curriculum changes which are administrative
in character

In an effort to cut paper work and duplication in the development and review of curricula by the All-College Curriculum Committee (ACCC) and the Senate Curriculum Committee (SCC), and in view of the fact that numerous changes in curricula appear to be largely administrative, the ACCC and the Senate Curriculum Committee have discussed the following modification in present procedure as presented in John Shrader's letter of September 25.

The SCC would like to present the following proposal for your consideration before it appears on a Senate agenda: that curricula changes which are administrative in character be directly forwarded to the appropriate deans for their approval, with copies forwarded to the ACCC master catalogue file and other concerned parties, without necessarily requiring ACCC action, and without requiring SCC action or Senate approval.

- 1) Course deletion - provided the course does not affect appreciably any other department than the one making the proposal.
- 2) Course credit change - unless the credit change will affect programs in other departments or cause an increase in credits in a departmental program beyond the 'allowed' maximum.
- 3) Change in course title - provided the course does not affect appreciably any other department than the one making the proposal.
- 4) Change in course description - provided the course does not affect appreciably any other department than the one making the proposal.
- 5) Changes in Pre-Professional Programs.
- 6) Change in course number - unless the change in course level is going to have an appreciable affect on programs (graduate).

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
4 p.m., Wednesday, December 2, 1970
Room L27 - Hertz Hall

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES, November 4, 1970
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS
 1. Letter from David G. Lygre, Department of Chemistry--
Pass-Fail policy.
- V. REPORTS
 - A. Executive Committee
 1. Report by Vice Chairman
 - B. Standing Committees
 1. Budget
 2. Code
 3. Curriculum
 4. Personnel
 5. Student Affairs
 - C. Report from the Chair
- VI. OLD BUSINESS
- VII. NEW BUSINESS
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Please Note: Due to the Thanksgiving holiday, there was no Bulletin announcement of the Faculty Senate meeting for December 2. Please inform members of your department that the Faculty Senate will be meeting in regular session on this date (December 2).

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF December 2, 1970

ROLL CALL

☒ Alexander, James
☒ Allen, John
☒ Anderson, David
☐ Berry, Kenneth
☒ Brooks, James
☒ Carlson, Frank
☒ Clark, Glen
☒ Collins, Frank
☒ Dillard, David
☒ Doi, Richard
☒ Douce, Pearl
☒ Duncan, L. C.
☒ Easterling, Ilda
☐ Fletcher, Steve
☒ Glauert, Earl
☒ Hammond, Kenneth
☒ Harsha, Kenneth
☒ Jakubek, Doris
☒ Jones, Robert
☒ Keller, Chester
☒ Ladd, Arthur
☒ Lawrence, Larry
☒ Leavitt, Gordon
☒ Lewis, Albert
☒ McGehee, Charles
☒ Nylander, James
☒ Odell, Elwyn
☒ Purcell, John
☒ Putnam, Jean
☒ Reed, Gerald
☒ Reid, Mike
☒ Ringe, Don
☒ Shadle, Owen
☒ Sparks, Larry
☒ Williams, Harold
☒ Wright, Cheryl

☐ Marco Bicchieri
☐ Robert Harris
☐ Frederick Lister
☐ Alan Bergstrom
☐ Edward Harrington
☐ Bill Floyd
☐ Sheldon Johnson
☐ Robert Benton
☐ App Legg
☐ James Sahlstrand
☐ Wesley Adams
☐ Ted Bowen
☐ Gerhard Kallienke

☐ Kent Richards
☐ Joel Address
☐ Earl Synnes
☐ Jim Parsley
☐ Charles Vleck
☐ Jay Bachrach
☐ Bryon Gore
☐ Donald King
☐ John DeMerchant
☐ Katherine Egan
☐ Frank Sessions
☐ Betty Hileman
☐ Robert Yee
☐ Don Wise
☐ Everett Irish
☐ James Klahn

☐ Steven Parkas
☐ Gerald Brunner
☐ Max Zwanziger
☐ Gordon Galbraith

VISITORS

PLEASE SIGN THIS SHEET

Faculty Senate Meeting

December 2, 1970

Edward J. Harrington
Donald M. Schleisman
Byron Gere

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

98926

November 19, 1970

*Cur Corn
Student affairs*

Dr. Kenneth Harsha
Chairman
Faculty Senate
Campus

Dear Dr. Harsha:

This letter is to request that the Faculty Senate, through its usual channels, consider the following proposed modification of the present pass-fail option. I believe a serious problem in the present option is the lack of motivation on the part of students taking a course on a pass-fail basis. Whether it should be or not, the fact of the matter is that grades are a significant motivating factor. On the other hand, the pass-fail option is a useful mechanism to encourage students to acquire a broader educational background.

I would like to propose that the pass-fail option be modified so that the student, at his option, may substitute the earned letter grade for a grade of S in any course taken on a pass-fail basis. The exercising of this option will not alter the requirement that a student be limited to a total of 15 quarter credits in the initial designation of a course as pass-fail.

I believe this modification would retain the desirable features of the pass-fail option and diminish some of the drawbacks. There undoubtedly would still be students who will abuse the option by working just hard enough to pass. However, I think that a significant number of students would have a greater interest and exert a greater effort in their pass-fail courses if this proposed option were available.

Thank you for your consideration of this proposal.

Sincerely,

David G. Lygre

David G. Lygre

DGL:bd

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kenneth Harsha, Chairman
Faculty Senate

FROM: Bernard L. Martin
Dean of Arts and Sciences

DATE: December 2, 1970

Relative to the funds which are to be returned to the State coffers because of two budget reductions requested by the Governor and the failure of the College to meet its budgeted enrollment, a total of \$415,900 must be returned. Of this amount, instructional areas (Programs 060 and 070) were asked to return a total of \$265,237 which is approximately 63.77% of the institution's total.

The academic Deans and the Academic Vice President have examined budgets and have been able to achieve the total savings amount from 060 and 070 programs through salary and operational savings. Much of the salary savings have accrued by employing replacement faculty at lower salaries, by not filling vacant positions and by withholding Civil Service positions. A breakdown follows:

1969	060 Salary Savings	\$ 44,258	
1969	060 Operational Savings	54,494	
1969	070 Operational & Salary Savings	10,162	
1970	060 Salary Savings	113,331	
	(Includes: 1970 Summer School		\$ 8,517
	D.V.P.		5,000
	Sick Leave		15,000
	Civil Service		3,200
	Student Village		4,810
1970	060 Operational Savings	19,928	
	(Includes: Faculty recruitment		\$ 9,100
	Office Furniture		3,500
	Consultants		3,000
	Calculator Center		425
	Academic Conferences		805
1970	070 Operational & Salary Savings	23,064	
	(Includes: Computer Services		\$ 5,500
	H.E.S.		5,913
	Symposium		6,000

The grand total of these savings figures is \$265,237.

cc President Brooks
Dr. Harrington
Dr. Green
Dr. Comstock
Faculty Senate

FACULTY SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
December 2, 1970

1. Balloting for the vacant at-large position will be completed Dec. 4, and the results will be distributed immediately thereafter.
2. As per Senate direction, an ad hoc committee to study and report on the need for a faculty Code of Conduct has been formed. Without objection, the membership will include:
 - Bud Klucking - Biological Sciences
 - Larry Lawrence - English
 - Jim Nylander - Physical Education
 - Keith Rinehart - English
 - Doug Sprague - History
3. A legislative committee has been formed to act as liaison between the faculty and the legislature, review bills which may be presented during the 1971 legislative session and meet with legislators to provide information or express faculty opinion. They will maintain contact with legislative committees from other campuses as well as with students and the Executive Committee of the Senate. They will ^{among other subjects} specifically be concerned with proposed student tuition and fee increases and changes in the TIAA program. Unless the Senate wishes to direct otherwise, the membership of the committee will be:

- Ken Berry - Education
- Frank Carlson - Education
- Beverly Heckart - History
- Jerry Jones - Chemistry
- Owen Shadle - Tech. & Industrial Ed.
- Skip Smith - Biological Sciences
- Charles Stastny - Political Science

4. The status of the proposed meeting of our legislative committee and the Senate Executive Committee with local legislators is —

up in the air —

The meeting will be held on December 8th at 2:00 p.m. in Grupe Conference Center. All Senators are welcome to attend.

5. 212 faculty (less than half) returned ballots for the straw vote on collective bargaining. Some form of collective bargaining was favored by 125. No form of collective bargaining ^{legislation} was favored by 70, and 17 were undecided.

On the options -

The Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act of 1967	- 25 votes
The Professional Negotiations Law	- 42 votes
New Legislation	- 73 votes
Strengthening of internal bargaining possibilities	- 60 votes

The general sense of the results has been conveyed to Representative Grant.

The Senate may wish to direct further action on the subject. *Final tabulations on the straw vote will be made available to the faculty.*

6. The time required to achieve a sense of the faculty sentiment on collective bargaining precludes such a ballot during the legislative session. We can make some preparations prior to the session, but rapid decisions may have to be made and the voice will be very weak if the Legislative Committee and/or Executive Committee members can speak only as individuals. We wish to ask at this time for a specific "vote of confidence" to allow the members of these committees, after consultation with other committee members, to speak on behalf of the faculty. I so move.
7. Another related item is funds to send individuals as needed to Olympia. Expenses will be minimized when joint travel can be arranged, but some other funds will be needed. Eastern manages with voluntary faculty donations of approximately ^{\$5.00} ~~\$10.00~~ each. ~~About 1/3 of the faculty donates~~. We would appreciate some comment on the idea of a legislative fund and/or methods of accumulating same.

through Central Facilitation.

8. The Executive Committee has followed the pronouncements of the Council on Higher Education with a growing sense of concern and ^{even} alarm. We believe this feeling is shared by many others on the faculty. We are in the process of drafting a letter to the Council questioning the desirability of proposed student tuition and fee increases, the justification for fees at the state colleges equal to those of the universities and the assumption that lower division students can be more economically or better educated at the community colleges and ought to be encouraged to attend community colleges through differential fees; inquiring as to the procedure of research and decision-making which the Council employs and the factual basis for their recommendations on costs, enrollment limitations and priorities, and commenting on some of the implications of such actions if they be implemented.

If the senators have suggestions for the proposed letter, they may be made now or in writing within the next two days. If there is majority objection to proceeding in behalf of the Faculty Senate, we need to know it now.

To elaborate I will comment briefly on the tuition and fee increases and Mr. Alexander on the proposed enrollment policies. The Council on Higher Education has recommended that tuition and fees at the state-supported four-year colleges and universities be equalized by 1972-73. The minimum level suggested is \$495.00 for residents and \$1,359.00 for non-residents. The upper limit is \$630.00 for residents and \$1,581.00 for non-residents. Community college fees would be one/half those for state colleges and universities. This does not mean more money for the institutions but simply less from the general fund. Part-time, extension and summer session fees would also be modified.

The Council further recommends that a fraction of the fees be set aside for student financial aids and programs of tuition and fee waivers would be discontinued.

Mr. Alexander:

9. The Executive Committee requested and received representation on the Committee on Faculty Load. *The Vice-Chairman will serve.* One meeting has been called and, in briefest summary, the faculty load formulas as currently written are probably inappropriate for an institution such as Central and ought to be changed.
10. The memo from President Brooks regarding Promotions has been discussed. The Executive Committee agrees that teaching performance ought to be one consideration for promotion. *To use it as the only measure would be a grave error.* We seriously question that a sampling of popularity at one point in time during a particular class provides a more valid or even equal basis for decision than the judgment rendered after years of association by colleagues and chairmen. We momentarily marveled at the prospect of applying the same criteria to administrators who in the past ~~seemingly automatically~~ *in departments* were granted full professorships and tenure by the Board of Trustees but cynically concluded that the hurdles *if that* would be placed only in front of the lower classes, namely teaching faculty. *is what it means*
11. The possibility of establishing a system whereby individual merchants might allow discounts for faculty has been discussed with Mr. Bohne. It was noted that the practice, though not systematic, is not unknown in Ellensburg at this time. Any initiative for further action ought to originate with the faculty.
12. The most recent request by the governor for a return of budgeted funds has resulted in *a* ~~the withdrawal of~~ *precommended by the Budget Committee and concurrence by Deans' Council* \$6,000 which would have supported the annual Spring Symposium. This does not mean the Symposium could not be held, as individual departments might wish to contribute. This action, coupled with the recent severe cut in Symposium allocations by the ASC, leads the Executive Committee to offer at this time the following motion:
- to with draw the*

I move that planning for the Spring, 1971 Symposium be discontinued and pending more stable financial arrangements, the Symposium be postponed *until 1972.*

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Senate Curriculum Committee

DATE: November 2, 1970

RE: Procedure for curriculum changes which are administrative in character

In an effort to cut paper work and duplication in the development and review of curricula by the All-College Curriculum Committee (ACCC) and the Senate Curriculum Committee (SCC), and in view of the fact that numerous changes in curricula appear to be largely administrative, the ACCC and the Senate Curriculum Committee have discussed the following modification in present procedure as presented in John Shrader's letter of September 25.

The SCC would like to present the following proposal for your consideration before it appears on a Senate agenda: that curricula changes which are administrative in character be directly forwarded to the appropriate deans for their approval, with copies forwarded to the ACCC master catalogue file and other concerned parties, *(without Chairmen and Curriculum committees)* without necessarily requiring ACCC action, and without requiring SCC action or Senate approval.

- 1) Course deletion - provided the course does not affect appreciably any other department than the one making the proposal.
- 2) Course credit change - unless the credit change will affect programs in other departments or cause an increase in credits in a departmental program beyond the 'allowed' maximum.
- 3) Change in course title - provided the course does not affect appreciably any other department than the one making the proposal.
- 4) Change in course description - provided the course does not affect appreciably any other department than the one making the proposal.
- 5) Changes in Pre-Professional Programs.
- 6) Change in course number - unless the change in course level is going to have an appreciable affect on programs (graduate).

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Senate Curriculum Committee

DATE: December 2, 1970

The Senate Curriculum Committee voted to recommend to the Senate the adoption of the following policy concerning the duplication of course titles:

Courses with substantially different content should carry separate titles. Courses with identical titles should be cross listed.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF December 2, 1970

ROLL CALL

~~no~~ Alexander, James
~~yes~~ Allen, John
~~yes~~ Anderson, David
~~yes~~ Berry, Kenneth
~~yes~~ Brooks, James
~~yes~~ Carlson, Frank
~~yes~~ Clark, Glen
~~yes~~ Collins, Frank
~~no~~ Dillard, David
~~no~~ Doi, Richard
~~yes~~ Douce, Pearl
~~abs~~ Duncan, L. C.
~~yes~~ Easterling, Ilda
~~yes~~ Fletcher, Steve
~~yes~~ Glauert, Earl
~~yes~~ Hammond, Kenneth
~~yes~~ Harsha, Kenneth
~~abs~~ Jakubek, Doris
~~abs~~ Jones, Robert
~~no~~ Keller, Chester
~~no~~ Ladd, Arthur
~~yes~~ Lawrence, Larry
~~yes~~ Leavitt, Gordon
~~yes~~ Lewis, Albert
~~no~~ McGehee, Charles
~~no~~ Nylander, James
~~yes~~ Odell, Elwyn
~~no~~ Purcell, John
~~yes~~ Putnam, Jean
~~yes~~ Reed, Gerald
~~yes~~ Reid, Mike
~~abs~~ Ringe, Don
~~yes~~ Shadle, Owen
~~yes~~ Sparks, Larry
~~yes~~ Williams, Harold
~~yes~~ Wright, Cheryl

Marco Bicchieri
 Robert Harris
 Frederick Lister
 Alan Bergstrom
 Edward Harrington
 Bill Floyd
 Sheldon Johnson
 Robert Benton
 App Legg
 James Sahlstrand
 Wesley Adams
 Ted Bowen
 Gerhard Kallienke

 Kent Richards
 Joel Andress
 Carl Symes
 Jim Parsley
 Charles Vleck
 Jay Bachrach
 Bryon Gore
 Donald King
 John DeMerchant
 Katherine Egan
 Frank Sessions
 Betty Hileman
 Robert Yee
 Don Wise
 Everett Irish
 James Klahn

 Steven Farkas
 Gerald Brunner
 Max Zwanziger
 Gordon Galbraith

Glauert
 better
 on
 course titles

14 yes
 18 for
 30 votes


To: Faculty Senate
From: Department of Anthropology
Re: Course double-listing
Date: November 2, 1970

This note is intended to clarify the position of the Department of Anthropology with respect to double-listed courses; specifically, Anthropology 273 and 373, now being submitted for approval.

This request by the Department of Anthropology is to be considered in the light of the following points:

1. The principle of double-listing is considered a necessity for this specific time of financial restrictions. Double-listing is therefore a temporary measure to be discontinued as soon as the restrictions are eased.
2. Courses double-listed by this department do have an independent role within the curriculum of the department. In the light of the restrictive situation coupled with the need for maintaining a set of courses for specialization in anthropology as well as meeting the load requirement imposed by the school, these courses are temporarily co-joined on a different credits and requirements basis so as to avoid the pre-emption of the more advanced courses due to limited enrollment.
3. The instructor teaching a double-listed course receives load point credit only for the higher number of credits in the combined courses (in the above case: only 4 credits). The double-listing technique is not considered an ideal teaching situation. In fact the ideal situation will be, as restrictions are lifted, to have these separate courses operate at the levels implied by their number. The department intends to turn to separate listing as soon as feasible.
4. The rush in the particular case of 273/373 is related to our wish to use the winter of 1971 as a term for experimenting in this type of solution to high enrollment/limited staff.

Yours cordially,



M. G. Bicchieri, Chairman
Department of Anthropology

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Senate Curriculum Committee
DATE: December 2, 1970
RE: All-College Curriculum Committee Proposals (ACCC)

The Senate Curriculum Committee recommends passage of the ACCC proposals, pages 131 through 139.

December 2, 1970

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairman, Faculty Senate

FROM: Senate Code Committee

RE: Code interpretations

1. Section 2.J.2. states that the chairman of a standing committee must be a senator. The Code Committee feels this is a valid stipulation, and does not recommend change.
2. While we do not agree with the present Code language, Section 2.H. specifically states that, if a senator is to be absent for a quarter or more, a replacement must be elected. This statement will be modified in the upcoming revision of the Code, but we do not propose a change at this time.
3. Section 2.H. and the interpretation of May 7, 1969, are somewhat nebulous concerning the term of office of the elected replacement for a senator who has resigned. The Code Committee interprets the term of the replacement to be the unexpired term of the senator who resigned. This statement will also be clarified in our revision.
4. A Legislative Committee and a Salary Committee will be added to the standing committee segment of the revised Code, if the chairman will provide the Code Committee with a statement of their charges.

Don Ringe, Chairman
Senate Code Committee

bgv